
APPENDIX:

CONTAINING

REMARKS

ON THE

Partial and Defective Account given in
the *Critical Review* for *January* last,

OF

Mr. BOWER's *Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*,
&c. and to *A New Charge*.

I FIND myself obliged to subjoin this extraordinary Paper to the two Pamphlets I have lately published, by the gross misrepresentations of my Defence in the account the authors of the *Critical Review* have given of it, as their Criticism may be read by some Persons who have not read my Pamphlets. These Gentlemen declare in their Plan, that *this work will be carried on by a set of Gentlemen who have seen with indignation the noble art of Criticism reduced to a contemptible manufacture, carried on by wretched Hirelings, without talent, candour, spirit, or circumspection; but as for themselves, that they have no connections to warp their integrity, no prejudices to influence their judgment; that they will not invidiously seek to wrest the sense, or misinterpret the words of any author; that they scorn to act as ministers of interest, faction, envy, or malevolence, but pretend to delineate the plan of every work with accuracy and*

A

candor.

candor. Now let us see with what *accuracy* and *candor* they have delineated the plan of my *Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, and to a *New Charge*, in the account they have lately published of them, and whether in that account they keep up to the character they assume of *candid, disinterested, unprejudiced Reviewers*.

I tell my readers, in page 33 of the first part of my *Answer*, that Father *Luthrel*, Rector of the College of the Jesuits at *Leghorn*, ascribed my leaving the Church of *Rome* and the Order of the Jesuits to my being tired of lying alone, and the want of a bed-fellow, meaning, that I was induced thereunto by the desire of marrying, and because I was tired of a single life. For this charge is brought by Papists against all who have made a vow of chastity, and afterwards turn Protestants, as was observed by Mr. *Bayle* in the life of the Jesuit *James Reihing*; and Father *Luthrel* knew well enough that I needed not have quitted the *Romish* Church, or the Order, to have a bed-fellow that was not a wife. In answer to that charge, I say, in page 33, that I was twenty years in *England* before I thought of a bed-fellow, such a bed-fellow as Father *Luthrel* meant, and four-and-twenty before I had one; which is as much as to say, that I was twenty years in *England* before I thought of marrying, and four-and-twenty before I did marry. I never pretended to the praise of having preserved an *inviolable chastity*, as the *Reviewers*, misinterpreting my words, would make the world believe that I have. On the contrary, I have ingenuously owned, in my *Answer to a New Charge*, page 25, that *from follies and frailties I have not been free*: but they were follies and frailties that injured no mortal, except myself. As for the marriage-contract with which I am charged, I have absolutely denied it: there was no such contract, nor any thing that could in equity be deemed such a contract, even by a jury of Ladies. This I affirm, and instances are not wanting of treaties of marriage having been broken off, even after the wedding-cloaths were bespoke, for very just and good reasons, though not fit to be published; much more may intimacies or courtships break off, when no promise of marriage has ever been made, without any stain upon the honour or character of either of the parties. Passion may at one time have suggested one conduct, and reason may afterwards point out another.

In points of that nature, when the parties are satisfied, it is impertinence in any body else to concern themselves with them. But what has all this to do with my *Popery*, or with the *Six Letters*, or even with my moral character? I chose to pay five hundred pounds rather than to have a law-suit in an affair of this nature. Might there not be good reasons, reasons of tenderness to the family and the lady, reasons of delicacy, a virtuous and commendable delicacy, which might induce me to think the loss of that money a less evil than saving it by the sentence of a jury in *Westminster-hall*? Suppose the tongues of Counsels there but the tenth part as flippant as the pens of the Libeller, or of the Reviewers, who, that could live without it, would not much rather give five hundred pounds, than have his own character, and that of a Gentlewoman with whom he had lived in an intimate friendship, become the subject of their abuse? And how cruel is it to be forced either to say too much on a subject so tender as this, or have one's silence misconstrued into a conscious avowal of having done wrong? I did not act in this matter without the advice of friends, on whose integrity, honour, and judgment, I could safely rely: none of them think the worse of me for it; but men who cannot know the grounds of my conduct, take upon themselves to pronounce that I acted dishonourably in it, and expect that the world shall confirm their judgment, when, for aught the world knows, I may be the injured person, if any is injured, in this affair. I will only add further, that had I conceived the least apprehension of such a demand, I should never have married without having adjusted the affair with the Lady: but I had no idea of it, and was as much surprised as my wife, when I heard the demand some months after my marriage.

In page 45, the Reviewers cannot help owning, that I wrote like an honest Protestant in 1730; but add, *how far this may go towards the vindication of Mr. B—r's character, or whether it will weigh against a scale of fact and evidence, we must leave our readers to determine: certain, however, it is, that a man may be an honest Protestant in 1730, and a rogue or a Papist in 1745.* Here they suppose every fact, every evidence produced against me by my enemies, to be true, whereas not one of any moment has yet been alleged

that I have not disproved to the full satisfaction of every candid reader. But it was, it seems, the business of these impartial Critics to conceal the Defence, and only acquaint the Public with the Charge.—If the passages I have quoted out of my *Historia Litteraria*, printed in 1730, prove me to have been no Papist at that time, which they certainly do, they prove what they were alleged to prove, and are a full confutation of the calumnies of my enemies pretending that I was *then* a Papist, nay, and that I acted as a missionary. The accusation of my having since relapsed into Popery I have confuted by other proofs. Where then is the pertinency, the candour, or the justice of this observation? It is, like most of their others, the petulance of an advocate retained to abuse an innocent man, instead of the sentence of an impartial and unprejudiced Judge. But let us hear how they go on with their examination and sentence. I write, in page 55 of my *Answer*, that *I heard, in all likelihood, the confession of the Nun Buonaccorsi, but cannot positively say I did, as in Italy the Nuns confess in a dark room, with an iron grate between them and the Confessor, covered on the inside with a veil, and very few of them chuse to let the Confessor know who they are.* Now, what is the observation the Critical Reviewers have made on this passage? *Mr. Bower acknowledges that he might probably have confessed this Lady among others; but that he never saw her, it being the custom to confess in a dark room, A CIRCUMSTANCE NOT UNFAVOURABLE TO A LIBIDINOUS JESUIT.* This is supposing that I was alone with her in a dark room: but they purposely forget the *Iron Grate* interposed between her and me. Was that a circumstance not unfavourable to a libidinous Jesuit? And is this a fair way of stating my answer to the charge brought against me? They go on to say, *the Jesuits pronounce Mr. B——r guilty of a criminal correspondence with the above-mentioned Nun, and Mr. B——r as warmly declares himself innocent; it can be directly and absolutely proved or disproved by none but the Lady herself.* But these unprejudiced Judges overlook the many strong and unanswerable arguments that I have alleged, from page 53 to 64 of my *Answer*, to prove that the Jesuits either never did attest that ridiculous story, or, if they did, that they attested what they themselves must have known to be false.

I do not insinuate that as the woman to whom I paid 500 l. cannot be the woman in the Letters, there never was any such woman at all, as these writers pretend, page 59: but, as the 500 l. were not demanded till three years after the Jesuits had repaid me my money, I conclude from thence, and conclude with good reason, that the vast solicitude I am made to express in the Letters to get my money from Father *Sheldon* cannot be ascribed, as it is by my Antagonist, to my being pressed about the payment of that Sum; in short, that I could not be so pressing in 1746 or 1747 for money to answer a demand that was not made till 1750. I likewise observe, that the Libeller's having so happily discovered this woman is not, as he pretends, a discovery of *the woman in the Letters*; but that it still remains very evident *there never was any such woman at all*, and consequently, that the foundation they rest on is false. The Libeller, conscious how greatly their credit must depend on the proof of that matter of fact, has tried to prop it up by the discovery of this woman, and lays a great stress upon it in his last Pamphlet. This evidence has been shewn to be nothing to the purpose; and yet these impartial and candid Reviewers treat the answer made to it as impertinent and quite useless to my *Justification* against the authenticity of the Letters in dispute.—In page 49, they only hint at my vindication of the character of Dr. *Aspinwall*, and call it a *circumstance foreign to the dispute between my adversary and me*. And do these discerning Critics think it foreign to the dispute for me to shew my Adversary to be a man capable of imposing upon the world as an unquestionable truth, every groundless, wicked, and malicious calumny the Papists can invent to defame those who have left them; and this with the most solemn protestations of his love for truth and zeal for the Protestant religion in his mouth? They might just as well pretend it to be foreign to the purpose for a person accused of a crime at the *Old Bailey*, to prove by other instances that his accuser had attested as an unquestionable truth what upon examination was found to be the blackest slander. Besides, was it a circumstance foreign to the dispute between my Adversary charging me with Popery and me to prove, that the person, with whom I lived in the greatest friendship and intimacy ever since a few months after my arrival in *England*,
and

and by whom I was introduced to the acquaintance of many Protestant families, lived and died a sincere Protestant? It was to hurt me that they charged him with Popery; and I could by no other means more effectually clear myself, than by clearing him from that imputation. — I shall take notice of only one more Observation made by these Gentlemen on the first part of my Answer. Their words are, page 46 :

This Libeller, as Mr. Bower calls him, having accused Mr. B. of shamefully breaking his word to the Public in regard to his promised account of his escape from the Inquisition, Mr. B. answers thus: ' I promised, it is true, to give an account of my escape from the Inquisition, as soon as I had completed the second volume of the History of the Popes, and would have performed my promise, had I not been advised, by many of my Friends, and Subscribers, and some for whose authority I had the greatest regard, to defer that account till the course of my History brought me naturally to the institution of that Tribunal.'

As mere Reviewers it might be thought sufficient for us to relate this evasive answer, but as Critical Reviewers we cannot pass it over without asking Mr. Bower one question, viz. whether if any Gentleman who owed him 500 l. which he had promised to pay at Lady-day, should notwithstanding by the advice of his friends defer it till Christmas, he the said Mr. Bower would admit this as a good plea for non-payment; or whether he would not on this occasion be inclined to suspect the integrity of the debtor, and signify this his opinion by the seasonable interposition of a bum-bailiff?

Would not one think, by the comparison here made to expose the reasons I allege for delaying to give an account of my escape from the Inquisition, according to my promise, that I had procured a Subscription, and taken money before-hand, for the Publication thereof, as soon as I had completed the Second Volume of the History of the Popes? Otherwise, where is the Analogy between such a promise deferred by the advice of many of the Subscribers to my History of the Popes who thought it would be more for the benefit of the Public that I should not interrupt that work by another, and a promise of paying 500 l. at Lady-day deferred till Christmas? — Of the same nature is another comparison made by the ingenious and candid Reviewers,

viewers, on part of my *Answer to a new Charge*. I say there, page 13, *the year 30 is a slip of my Pen, or an error of the Press; for no man can suppose I intended to say less in my Pamphlet than I had said in my Affidavit*. Upon this the Reviewers make the following note, page 60:

A person was last week apprehended and committed to Newgate for forgery on the South-Sea company, to the value of 1000 l. Query, whether if he alleges in his defence, at the Old Bailey, that it was only a slip of his Pen, he will or will not be acquitted? The bare repetition of this is sufficient to shew the impertinence as well as the injustice and malignity of it. Such is the ACCURACY and such the CANDOR with which they pretend to delineate the plan of every work, and have accordingly delineated that of my Defence. But these Gentlemen are so desirous of shewing their wit, that they are not at all concerned for the opinion it may give to the world of their candor and judgment.

I thought it necessary for me to appeal to the Public against such judges, especially as their Criticism may be read by some persons who have not read my Pamphlets. And having done this, which I hope will be enough to put the Public on their guard, I shall leave them for the future to be as smart upon me as they please.

As for the authors of the *Monthly Review*, the account they give of my Defence is quite as partial and defective as that which their brothers the Critical Reviewers have endeavoured to impose upon the world; and they conclude it with observing, *that though I have defended myself very speciously, in regard to several particulars, yet the attentive reader will perceive that I enlarge upon what is comparatively of small importance, and seemingly endeavour to draw off the Reader's attention from the principal parts of the accusation, which I pass slightly over, page 67.* The parts I enlarge upon are, that I was Counsellor of the Inquisition; that I fled from *Italy*, shocked at the cruelties of that Tribunal; that I renounced the errors of Popery in 1726; that since that time I never have assisted at any function of the Popish Religion, nor performed any, but, on the contrary, have expressed, on all occasions and in all companies, the greatest abhorrence and contempt of the doctrines and superstitious practices of the Church of *Rome*, and even exposed them and writ against them, twenty-six years

years ago; and lastly, that it was not with any intention or design of returning to that Church, or to the Order of the Jesuits, that I sunk my money in the hands of Mr. Hill, but merely for the sake of better interest; and that it was impossible I could have taken a bond from the Jesuits for the security of my money, if I had had any thoughts of returning to the Order. These are the particulars that I have enlarged upon. And are these particulars of small importance, in the opinion of these *very* acute and unbiassed censors? Of the Letters I have indeed said very little in the first part of my *Answer*, but I there promise to demonstrate them, in the second part, to be a most impudent and barefaced forgery, and have done so to the full satisfaction of every candid reader. My reasons these impartial Reviewers either misrepresent, curtail, and strive to weaken, like their brethren the *Critical Reviewers*, or utterly suppress, while they set forth those of my Antagonist to the best advantage, and enforce them with reflections of their own. Him, with a soul full of fury, and the most unchristian language in his mouth, they commend and extol to the skies, for *great goodness of heart and a truly Christian disposition*: they even recite at length his canting declamation, only calculated to give more weight, under the mask of religion, to his scurrilous slander and abuse, and recommend it to my *serious perusal*, as a *well-written and pathetic exhortation*.

I shall close these few remarks with an observation published, unknown to me, by a lover of justice and truth, in a News-Paper: *Should a Judge at any time instruct a Jury in the manner the Public is here instructed (viz. in the Monthly, to which I may justly add the Critical Review) in the cause depending between Mr. Bower and his Accusers, his memory would be consigned over to infamy by all the lovers of Justice and of Mankind.*

22: 9:49

F I N I S.